

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary  
Marine Reserves Working Group**

Tuesday, August 22, 2000  
8:30 A.M.-5:00 P.M.  
Goleta Community Center  
Goleta, California

**Meeting Summary**

**Adopted by Consensus of the Working Group September 26, 2000**

---

**In Attendance:**

Patty Wolf, Co-Chair	Tom Raftican
Matt Pickett, Co-Chair	Steve Roberson
Lucky Brown	Alicia Stratton
Marla Daily	
Gary Davis	Michael Eng, Facilitator
Robert Fletcher	John Jostes, Facilitator
Dr. Craig Fusaro	
Dale Glantz	Staff from CINMS: Dr. Satie Airame, Sean Hastings
Neil Guglielmo	Carla Navarro
Greg Helms	
Mark Helvey	
Deborah McArdle	Members of the public
Dr. Michael McGinnis	
Chris Miller	

- 1. Welcome and Introductions:** Patricia Wolf, Co-chair, thanked the working group members for their attendance and dedication to the reserve issue. She shared a few Dept. of Fish and Game announcements, namely, that the last Fish and Game Commission meeting (Aug. 3-4) considered actions to close the Cow Cod fishery in an effort to rebuild the current stock. One proposed action would involve closing a total of 6500 sq. miles from the Channel Islands to the Mexican border.

Patty also reported that the Pacific Fishery Management Council has expressed concern about the current harvest rates of Bocaccio and Lingcod. The total catch for this year has been limited to 2 tons from all sources, which is significantly lower than previous years. The Marine Recreational Fishery Statistical Survey (MRFS) indicates a higher than expected catch rate for Bocaccio, which is in conflict with the low level catch regulations. Management measures will be discussed in an Ad Hoc allocation meeting later this week.

Matt Pickett, Co-chair, welcomed the working group and public and detailed the recent Santa Barbara News Press news releases on the reserves process. He plans to meet with local editors and radio stations to provide accurate baseline knowledge regarding the MRWG and the Sanctuary's Management Plan Revision. Regarding the management plan revision, the Sanctuary Advisory Council recently recommended two of the six boundary and regulatory alternatives, which include boundary alternative #2 (extending the boundary to the rural shoreline north of Goleta) and boundary alternative #5 (squaring off the boundaries at the current 6 mile limit). The facilitators, members of the Marine Reserves Working Group and the audience introduced themselves.

- 2. Adoption of Meeting Summaries from 7/18/00:** John Jostes led the group in a review of the July meeting summary. A variety of minor changes were noted and accepted. It was highlighted that the November MRWG Meeting will take place on November 15<sup>th</sup> not November 16<sup>th</sup> as indicated in the draft meeting notes:

The revised meeting summary was adopted by a consensus of the Working Group.

- 3. Process Overview, Management Plan Boundary issues and Press:** John Jostes asked if there were any additional comments about the recent press releases. Neil Guglielmo clarified that his statements in the Santa Barbara News-Press were meant to express some concern for the future of fisheries, and recreational and public

enjoyment within the context of enforcement, economic impact, and total closed areas for marine reserves. Patricia Wolf expressed satisfaction with the articles, and the positive comments made by MRWG participants. She is looking forward to future outreach and optimistic about the process and public input. Chris Miller mentioned that Florida newspapers were the primary source of information for the public about the process regarding the Tortugas process in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

Chris Miller requested that any changes in draft materials should be in italics or underlined so that they are distinguishable and the record is clear.

#### **CINMS Management Plan Revision**

The two boundary alternatives recommended by the Sanctuary Advisory Council during their August 16, 2000 were briefly discussed.

Neil Guglielmo mentioned that he has some concern over the larger CINMS boundary alternative and its effect on users, especially fishermen. He questioned whether it would be more important to set reserve areas before exploring boundary alternatives. Matt Pickett said that the preferred boundary alternative will be released in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement expected this Fall. Tom Raftican noted that each boundary size alternative carries additional considerations for reserve design. John Jostes suggested moving directly to the Open Discussion Period to further explore this and other issues.

#### **4. Open Discussion Period**

John Jostes and Michael Eng led the group in an open discussion of issues of concern to MRWG members. The following topics were raised during this time:

- Implications of Sanctuary boundary expansion on the Marine Reserves Working Group process
- Scientific modeling process
- Science panel's role in developing monitoring protocol/adaptive management design
- Identifying research questions and design
- Ask science panel how other rockfish of concern may benefit from the reserve
- Relationship between the MRWG process and other Fish and Game rockfish reserve options, e.g. cow cod
- Climate change variability and policy brief
- Alternates' roles

#### **Role of Alternates**

Patty Wolf began the discussion by reading the MRWG ground rules for the use of alternates in the case of primary member absence. She encouraged members to attend the meetings regularly to maintain continuity in the Working Group process; Patty also mentioned that alternates should not be used on a permanent basis. Chris Miller talked about his absence being due to the demanding schedule of working with fisheries organizations. Chuck Janisse, Ventura County Commercial Fishermen liaison, will be Chris' new alternate. Chuck confirmed his commitment to the Working Group and has been trying hard to get up to speed. Chris and Chuck will work together on representing their constituency and participate as much as possible. Most of the MRWG members expressed the desire to maintain continuity in attendance especially in the next few months, when the most critical issues will be discussed and resolved. Members were reminded that the final recommendation can only be ratified by the designated members and not their alternates.

#### **Relationship of other Sanctuary and Fish and Game processes to the MRWG process**

Greg Helms believes that the MRWG should remain true to considering reserves within the current 6-mile Sanctuary boundary, as originally intended. It will not only serve to maintain the focus of the Working Group but inoculate the Sanctuary against future reserve considerations created by the Marine Life Protection Act. Robert Fletcher feels that if the proposed Cow Cod closure goes into effect and the MRWG does not consider this into the final reserve plan, then the overall process has failed. He thinks that ignoring outside measures is problematic. Furthermore, if rockfish are to be federally regulated then the MRWG should consider excluding

rock fish from the reserve plan. Craig Fusaro mentioned that the MRWG needs to consider all elements (user groups, public) so that the MRWG reserve recommendations stands when future protection is imposed by the Marine Life Protection Act. He wondered how the protection of Santa Barbara Island in the Cow Cod closure would interact with marine reserve design in the context of ecosystems. Deborah McArdle agreed with the need to integrate outside processes that relate to the MRWG process. Sean Hastings felt that the Marine Life Protection Act process and MRWG process complement each other, however, implementation issues will need to be considered. Patty Wolf added that the Cow Cod closure is a fisheries management measure that is different from a marine reserve. Furthermore, this closure is focussed on a single species while the MRWG should think more about ecosystem-oriented measures.

The challenge is to be aware of outside activities but keep the reserve process on track. Steve Roberson noted that the Cow Cod closure measure addresses deep water (>400 ft) areas that are not commonly fished, especially around the Channel Islands. He believes that the near-shore reserve considerations of the MRWG is a different situation; the proposed Cow Cod protection would begin near 40 fathoms (250 ft) and may not overlap with MRWG proposed reserve areas. Neil Guglielmo expressed his concern for the potential economic hardship that may be imposed on fishermen. Mike McGinnis added that 10-15% of the total fish catch in California is caught within the boundaries of the Sanctuary. He also felt that the relationship between shorebirds and fish species should be included as part of the ecosystem considerations. There was the general consensus that the MRWG should be aware of outside developments but cannot integrate every management strategy. Matt Pickett suggested that John Ugoretz, (DFG) and Sean Hastings, (CINMS) track the status of outside processes and keep the MRWG informed.

#### **Climate Change Variability and Policy Brief**

Mike McGinnis wrote a policy review of climate change and strategies for incorporating flexible management strategies. He summarized the major impacts on coastal and marine systems, as determined by the White House Task Force on Climate Change. They are: (1) Increases in sediment run-off, (2) High impacts on biodiversity and habitats, (3) High impacts on coastal zones and (4) Increases in sea surface temperature and sea level. He further added that the MRWG needs to recognize the potential impacts from climate and ocean variability. Mike will provide the policy brief and background materials to the MRWG.

The discussion of other issues was deferred to a later point in time to maintain progress in moving through the day's agenda.

#### **5. Preliminary Discussions of Inclusion and Exclusion Areas**

##### Kelp Harvester's Perspective

Dale Glantz provided the MRWG with inclusion/exclusion areas based on kelp harvesting efforts. Summary of major points from the presentation are as follows:

- Since the 1940s, kelp canopies have been harvested from the Channel Islands. The harvested areas represent approximately 5% of the Sanctuary and provide an important, year-round yield.
- The described areas can be harvested despite variable weather conditions. This is critical because the food and pharmaceutical industry requires a year-round supply due to the limited shelf life of agar products and the high demand for the product.
- Kelp is available year-round, yet abundance varies seasonally: high growth in the spring, declines in the summer due to increases in water temperature and grows again in the fall.
- The costs associated with harvesting increase depending on the amount of travel to/from San Diego (company facilities). When travel is extensive, production costs may equal selling costs and no profits are realized.
- Channel Islands are an important economic resource; representing approx. \$6 million, of the \$40 million yearly profit.

Dale Glantz answered specific questions from the MRWG about regulations, methods, competition and economics associated with kelp harvesting. John Jostes asked members of the Working Group to write notes on the presentation for future personal reference.

#### Cultural Resources Perspective

Marla Daily described a map of the Channel Islands prepared by Sanctuary Staff to illustrate areas of long term recreational use during the last century.

- She reviewed records of areas used by humans for various recreational purposes (tent activities, farming, boating access, etc.) and identified 38 locations where use is concentrated.
- Major points of access were identified based on recreational activities such as: shelter for boats, anchorage, pleasure sites, camping, fishing camp, landing permit, recreational fishing, snorkeling, and diving.
- She did not include all sites used by humans, only those that have the most extensive use.
- In relation to reserve design, recreational users will be affected if a heavy use area is included as part of the reserve.
- She feels special consideration must be given to accommodate emergency anchoring.

Satie will make an 8.5x11 sized copy of the map available for review. John Jostes asked members of the MRWG to write some brief notes on the presentation for future reference.

#### Lobster Fisherman's Perspective

Chris Miller, Vice President for the Lobster Trappers Association, made a short presentation on inclusion/exclusion areas for lobster fishermen. Major points from his presentation include:

- Presented a map of the Channel Island to illustrate habitat areas and identify essential fishery areas.
- Some habitats are valuable due to weather influences, access to fishermen, terrain, habitat size and productivity.
- In relation to reserve design, areas should be chosen first then analyzed to see if they align with criteria versus using criteria to choose areas.
- Relationship of economic data versus quasi-anecdotal exclusion areas. Kelp/squid/urchin catch areas are more economically intensive whereas other fisheries are more spatially oriented and economic areas will not reflect this.

Following the presentation, Neil Guglielmo commented that the identified areas of importance for each fisheries group are different. He feels that the scientific data is important to identify potential reserve areas in terms of biological and habitat diversity. In essence, each major user group will have to compromise some of their harvest areas to reach a consensus towards developing viable, no-take reserves.

## **6. DFG Presentation on Marine Life Protection Act Process**

Paul Reilly, representative from the Department of Fish and Game, made a presentation on the Marine Life Protection Act process. He outlined the objectives of the Master Plan, network requirements, and deadlines.

Some major points of the presentation:

- The Master Plan Team is made up of scientists and agency representatives, and poorly funded.
- There are approximately 52 marine protected areas in the State of California that will likely be reclassified.
- The panel will recommend at a minimum 2 to 3 replicates of the same habitat type within each biogeographical region based on the described criteria to be considered for protection.
- Designations include: (1) State Marine Reserve; no-take reserve except for scientific studies that will be evaluated on a case by case basis, (2) State Marine Park; allows recreational fishing but no commercial fishing, (3) State Marine Conservation Area; certain restrictions placed on recreational and commercial fisheries.

- The MRWG process is serving as a model process and the MRWG recommendations will likely fold into the MLPA process, unless the reserve design does not consider the criteria covered by the MLPA.

## 7. Remaining Goals and Objectives

The discussion of remaining Goals and Objectives began with a focus on those related to new proposed revisions to the Research Goals and Objectives as an alternative approach to issues related to Sustainable Harvested Populations. Greg Helms relayed common ideas held by commercial fishery groups and environmentalists: (1) recognition by all parties that there is a wilderness element, (2) biodiversity can be seen as enhancement, (3) marine reserves are a tool directly related to fisheries management. There was considerable discussion and questions raised by the MRWG as a whole regarding the suggested changes and approach. After a thorough discussion of concerns and interpretation, the MRWG as a whole reached consensus on the following set of Goals and Objectives regarding Research.

### **Research**

#### **Goals:**

1. *To monitor ecosystem functions and acquire baseline data to distinguish natural processes from human impacts; and*
2. *To evaluate the short- and long-term effectiveness of reserves for managing living resources, including harvested populations.*

#### **Objectives:**

1. *To design reserves that will be tractable for monitoring of biological and physical processes.*
2. *To develop a monitoring and evaluation to facilitate an adaptive approach to management.*
3. *To evaluate short- and long-term differences between reserve and non-reserve areas.*
4. *To study the effects of marine mammal predation on marine populations in, adjacent to, and distant from reserves.*
5. *To provide for water quality testing near and distant from reserves.*

#### **Research Objectives for Fishery Management**

1. *To design reserves to test their ability to*
  - (1) *replenish and recover marine populations of interest, including harvested populations, and*
  - (2) *export larvae and adult individuals to areas outside reserve boundaries.*
2. *To provide for systematic study of nearshore species, including (1) larval export, (2) adult migration, (3) relative abundances, (4) size-frequency distributions, and (5) other topics of interest.*
3. *To provide long-term continuity in effort, expertise, and funding during reserve monitoring and evaluation.*

The above set of goals and objectives were adopted to take the place of the goals and objectives adopted on June 8, 2000 by the MRWG related to Sustainable Harvested Populations. This change language was based upon the mutual understanding on the part of all MRWG members that it would serve as a refinement to the group's intentions for reserve design as communicated to the Science Advisory Panel rather than a change in direction to the Science Panel.

In addressing the goals and objectives related to Reserve Administration and Enforcement, considerable discussion also took place. The MRWG adopted the following language and provisions in an attempt to reach closure and consensus on this set of goals and objectives reproduced below. In doing so the MRWG provided for the Facilitator's to craft additional language to capture the intent of fishing interests to include a program of community oversight as an additional objective, and to frame language to provide additional clarification in regard to data management for inclusion within implementation language elsewhere in the recommendation. (As with other references to consensus agreements, language for which consensus has been reached is indicated in italics and provisional language is indicated as non-italicized and via underlining and strike-out)

### ***Reserve Administration***

#### **Goal:**

*To effectively respond to the Problem Statement and achieve the goals and objectives of this program of marine reserves through:*

- *Effective agency coordination and accountability;*
- *Community oversight;*
- *Data management;*
- *Adequate funding; and,*
- *Appropriate enforcement practices.*

#### **Objectives**

##### ***Agency Coordination and Accountability***

1. *To create and adopt interagency Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), Memoranda of Agreement (MOA), or other means to memorialize agency commitment to the marine reserves program by the California DFG, CINMS, NMFS, FWS and NPS and other responsible agencies with jurisdiction.*
2. *To develop and adopt a monitoring, evaluation and data management plan for goals and objectives that explicitly contribute to adaptive management.*
3. *To develop procedures to insure and maintain consistent interpretation, application and enforcement of regulations across agencies.*

##### ***Community Oversight***

*PLACEHOLDER FOR ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE*

[Recommended Language - suggested but not yet approved by MRWG:

1. *To convene a standing community oversight committee to review implementation, the effectiveness of reserve administration and monitoring, and to ensure that community concerns can be expressed and addressed.]*

##### ***Funding***

1. *To develop cooperative interagency agreements (among CINMS, CINP, DFG and NMFS, and other agencies) to seek and commit annual funding and other in-kind support to support reserve administration.*
2. *To provide operational support and seek a dedicated funding stream to implement and maintain: marine reserve design, research, monitoring, and evaluation.*
3. *To develop a protocol in which each agency annually reports its funding contributions to the CINMS or other designated lead agencies.*
4. *To explore the utilization of non-profit organizations. [develop] a Regional Fisheries Trust and other implementation strategies as methods of institutionalizing long term program funding.*

##### ***Enforcement***

1. *To develop an enforcement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and cooperative enforcement plan with the NMFS, DFG, CINP, CINMS, and Coast Guard.*
2. *To design clear and discernable reserve boundaries.*
3. *To enlist community participation in marine reserve management and enforcement in order to maximize the cost-effectiveness of the enforcement program.*
4. *To cross-deputize enforcement officers.*
5. *To provide operational support and seek a dedicated funding stream to maintain an active presence on the water and in the air.*
6. *To develop explicit regulations and restriction that are clear and consistently interpreted.*
7. *Use state of the art enforcement resources, reserve dedicated offices, and vessels.*

In addition to the above language, the MRWG asked that new language be crafted regarding data management and proposed to the group between meetings. The Facilitation Team crafted the following language based upon input from fishing interests:

**NEW LANGUAGE RELATED TO DATA MANAGEMENT (TO BE INCORPORATED INTO IMPLEMENTATION LANGUAGE OUTSIDE OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BUT WITHIN THE OVERALL RECOMMENDATION)**

1. Create and adopt Interagency memoranda of understanding to define integrated management framework, responsibilities and accountability.
2. Seek commitments of adequate resources of time, funding and expertise to assure adequate and ongoing monitoring, synthesis, interpretation, and reporting of information.
3. Undertake preliminary surveys to provide baseline information to gauge reserve performance.
4. Design monitoring strategies to produce definitive results through an explicit reporting process including clearly stated monitoring objectives to address priority issues, and quality assurance programs to ensure that the type, amount and quality of data meets research objectives
5. Design a data management program that provides mechanisms to ensure data is processed, summarized, and reported to concerned individuals, organizations and agency representatives in an easily understood format on a regular (e.g., bi-annual) basis. Seek an ongoing funding base to maintain adequate data management capacity.
6. Design and implement a program for dissemination of information from ongoing studies in a useable and accessible format that can provide information for better environmental protection and management.
7. Design the monitoring and evaluation program with built in mechanisms for periodic review and that allows for program adjustments that are responsive when monitoring results or new information from other sources justifies program refinement.

The MRWG also agreed that the facilitation team should recirculate language related to Socioeconomic Goals and Objectives between meetings and seek input so as to expedite the group's consideration of those issues at its September meeting.

**8. Presentation by the Socioeconomic Panel**

Peter Wiley, NOAA, one of the Socioeconomic Panel leads, made a short presentation on the socioeconomic analysis process. Summary of his major points follows:

- The analysis will primarily involve using a multiplier to quantify loss of output, income and employment based on the 1x1 square mile cells that are also being used by the scientific panel.
- The Panel still hasn't received data from fisheries (except squid fisheries) to include as part of the analysis; he asked if there were any issues preventing data collection that may be resolved.
- Without the fisheries economic data, the MRWG will not have sufficient information on which to base their option development.
- In order to apply socio-economic data in the MRWG's decision support process, data must be made available within 2 weeks in order for the model to be ready in time for next month's meeting.
- The available data will be used to conduct an impact analysis post-MRWG decision.

Chuck Janisse said that there are 2 future meetings aimed at getting fishermen's input, there has been 45 interviews completed so far. He thinks two major factors that are slowing down data acquisition: (1) fishermen are hard to track down and, (2) some don't want to release any information. Patty Wolf offered some help; she can contact DFG in Sacramento who can speed up the process in releasing log book commercial fisheries data. Chris Miller thinks that there is a common sentiment among fishermen that any information they reveal is "going to be used against us". He has also had to work under tight time constraints and that many fishermen are away following different fisheries this time of year. He suggested

extending data collection an additional month so that more data could become available. Greg Helms supported the idea and added that the science panel was given more time for their analysis and that fairness would allow fishermen to have more time. Tom Raftican suggested obtaining boat registration information from Dept of Fish and Game. Craig Fusaro prefers that adequate time be allowed for the fisheries data collection, to prevent "doing a bad study". Gary Davis felt that there may be enough data already, perhaps there is no need for an extension. Chuck Janisse feels that the available data is biased towards abalone fishers and not a true representation of all commercial fishers. Matt Pickett felt that the reserve decision would be based on the best available data at the time of analysis. He also indicated that the inclusion/exclusion data Chris Miller had presented earlier is important and could possibly be used as a proxy for the analysis. Matt added that every month delay costs approx. \$10,000 in process costs, money that could be spent on implementation, research or enforcement issues. The Group discussed the costs/benefits of delaying data collection one month versus proceeding as planned. A straw poll vote to delay option development one month resulted in a tie. After further discussion, the final consensus was to use current available data for analysis including any information that was presented by the maritime community this morning. The analysis will continue as planned and initial Science Panel recommendations and socio-economic panel data will be presented to the Working Group at the September 25 meeting. Existing data collection efforts will continue until a September 19<sup>th</sup> deadline at which time no additional information will be integrated into the Socioeconomic Team analysis and presentation. The data submitted within this deadline will be used to fine-tune the recommended options at the October meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.**

**Future MRWG Meeting Dates:**

September 26 & 27, 2000 Veterans Hall Santa Barbara, CA  
October 18 & 19, 2000 Veterans Hall Santa Barbara, CA  
November 15, 2000 Veterans Hall Santa Barbara, CA

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

1. Adopted Revised Goals and Objectives related to "Reserve Administration", except for "Community Oversight" objectives that will be discussed during subcommittee meetings.
2. Sean Hastings and John Ugoretz will track outside processes and provide an update to the MRWG.
3. Socioeconomic Panel will conduct socioeconomic data analysis and present initial recommendations to the MRWG on September 25, 2000.
4. Remaining commercial fisheries data will be considered if provided to the Socioeconomic Panel no later than September 19, 2000. After this date, data collection efforts will end.
5. The enforcement and public outreach subcommittees will meet on August 23, 2000.
6. Satie will make an 8.5x11 sized copy of the visitor use map.